THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.*" Luke 2. 14

"*How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth Salvation.*" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. II. SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1824. NO. 7.

INTOLERANCE.

The following account of the proceedings of the Presbyterian Church in Brownville, against Mrs. JERUSHA TORREY, a worthy and respectable member of that church, because she dared to believe in the "Restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," is evincive of the spirit by which our modern sectarians are governed, and will enable a candid public to judge whether they are influenced by that charity, which "believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," and which is so strongly urged upon all Christians by our Saviour and his inspired Apostles.

The motives for publishing these proceedings will be best explained in Mrs. Torrey's own language, in the following letter to the Rev. Mr. Wells.

Brownville, May 12, 1824.

REV. SIR,—Your letter, with the roll of papers, I received in due time, and as I intend that the proceedings shall be made public, I wish to know whether you would prefer that the unofficial letters which you have written me on the subject, should be published or not. Be assured, sir, it is not for the purpose of gratifying a censorious or uncharitable disposition, that I am induced to lay this subject before the public, but from a sense of duty. Justice to myself, to my family, and to community, demands it. To myself it is due, that as far as it is known that I am under church censure, it may be known also, that it is not for *immoral* or *improper* conduct, that I am censured. To my children it is due, as the good reputation of parents is peculiarly dear to children, and as it is too often the case, that the finger of scorn is pointed at them, on account of the real or supposed improprieties of their parents; and to the public it is due, as I consider it of importance, that all who are, or may become subject to church governments, should be made acquainted with the manner in which those governments are administered. Please to send an answer by the bearer of this, and you will oblige yours, &c.

JERUSHA TORREY.

Rev. N. M. Wells.

To this letter Mr. Wells returned an answer, stating that it was a matter of "perfect indifference" with him, whether the letters were published or not; but advising Mrs. Torrey, on her own account, not to make any of the proceedings public. Whether Mr. Wells and his Session felt a "*perfect indifference*" on the subject or not, we shall leave our readers to judge, and without any further observations, shall proceed to lay the proceedings before them, in the order in which they occurred.

Brownville Tues. morn. Feb. 3, 1824.

DEAR FRIEND,—The church have set apart Wednesday of this week, as a day of fasting and prayer, we shall meet at Mr. Ballard's, at 11 o'clock, A. M.—There will be a meeting of the Session after the church meeting—it is the wish of the Session that you should meet with them, if you can make it convenient.

Your friend, &c.

N. M. WELLS.

Mrs. Jerusha Torrey.

Brownville Wed. noon. Feb. 4, 1824.

REV. SIR,—As the little girl who lives with me is absent on a visit to her mother, and having no one with whom I can with propriety leave my children, it will be very inconvenient for me to attend the meeting of the Session. If you think you cannot with propriety give me a dismission from the church, or a recommendation, (which favor I ask) but think it proper that I should be suspended, I wish you to proceed according to the Presbyterian discipline. I think that an offence which demands the suspension of an individual from the privileges of the church, demands likewise the regular preliminary steps. Please to add specifications to the charges, and oblige yours,

JERUSHA TORREY.

Rev. N. M. Wells.

Brownville, Feb. 4, 1824.

DEAR FRIEND,—Yours of the above date has been received—The Session will comply with your request.

Your's &c. N. M. WELLS.

It may be remarked, that at the above mentioned meeting of the church, which was previous to the exhibition of any charges against Mrs. Torrey, Mr. Wells declared that the only complaint against her, was for a *difference of opinion*, in which he really believed she was *honest* and *sincere*; and in a conversation which took place during the pendency of the proceedings, he stated to her that the Sessions were authorized to give her a dismission, or a letter to enable her to unite with a *Baptist* or *Methodist* church, but that they could not for the purpose of enabling her to join a *Universalist* church, because by so doing they should acknowledge that they did not believe that they (the Universalists) "held the truth in unrighteousness."

FIRST CITATION.

Brownville, Feb. 13.

Mrs. JERUSHA TORREY,—It is reported by common fame, that you have departed from those articles of faith, to which you have once given your assent, and which are believed by this church of which you are a member, to be the fundamental and essential doctrines of the Gospel.—viz.

That you disbelieve that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

That you deny the Godhead of the Son and his equality with the Father.

That you deny the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost.

That you deny the divine institution and sanctity of the Holy Sabbath.

And finally, that you deny that those who die in their sins, will go away into everlasting punishment.

You are therefore hereby cited to appear before the Session of this church, at the house of Mr. Wells, on Tuesday the 24th of the present month, at three o'clock, P. M. to answer to the above reports. Done by order of the Session.

N. M. WELLS, *Mod'r.*

Brownville, Feb. 19.

REV. SIR,—I received yours of the 13th, citing me to appear before the Session, and answer to the reports of common fame, which state that I have departed from the articles of faith to which I have once assented. I presume you refer to the written articles of the church, which were read to me at the time I became a member. If so, I would ask the favor of perusing them—if you will have the goodness to send them by the boy, you will oblige a friend.

JERUSHA TORREY.

Rev. N. M. Wells.

P. S. Be good enough to inform me whether you consider this the first or second citation: likewise, whether you calculate to bring the subject to a close or not, on the 24th. J. T.

To the above communication no written answer was returned. The articles of faith adopted by the church were sent, and a verbal notice that the Session would be adjourned to the 26th, at the same place and time of day.

ARTICLES OF FAITH, being a summary of the Westminster confession of Faith.

1st. You believe there is one God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, who is blessed and glorious forever and ever; who made all things, and that all things were made for him, and shall be for his glory.

2d. That this glorious God is one undivided essence, eternally existing, without change in his nature or purposes, and that his care and providence extend to all things.

3d. That He is a pure, spiritual existence, omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent, holy, wise and good.

4th. That the Creator and preserver of all things, ought to be worshipped and served in sincerity and truth by all mankind.

5th. That the scriptures, written by holy men, and commonly called the old and new testaments, were dictated by the spirit of God, and contain a perfect rule of faith and manners.

6th. That Jesus Christ is the son of God, and that God dwells in him in all his fulness, and that through his mediation only, sinners can be saved from the curse of the law.

7th. That all men are by nature sinners, and will never truly turn to God, if left to their natural inclinations. That God has given the Holy Spirit, with his word, to renew the hearts of his people.

and to carry on the work of grace in them to the day of Jesus Christ.

8th. That the outward ordinances of the new testament, are to be statedly, and faithfully observed by all the churches of saints, until Christ's second coming.

9th. That Christ will never leave his church militant, but uphold and preserve it, until he has completed the salvation of all that the Father hath given him, and conquered all his and their enemies.

10th. That he will finally raise the dead, and judge the world in righteousness, and doom the wicked to hell, and take the righteous to glory.

Brownville, Feb. 26.

To the Session of the Presbyterian Church in Brownville—I received yours of the 13th, citing me to appear before the Session, and anwer to the charge of having departed from those articles of faith, to which I had once assented.

Having carefully examined those written articles, and compared them with the charge prefered against me; and also, after an attentive examination of the articles of discipline adopted by the general assembly, for the government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; I am confident that my case is not cognizable by this session, or any other judicatory, either civil or ecclesiastical. In those articles of discipline, I find no authority for a judicial proceeding against any person, who is not accused of the commission of some crime or sin.—I would refer you to book 2d. chap. 3d. sec. 4th and 5th.

The laws of the U. S. secure to ever individual the liberty of conscience, and the peaceable enjoyment of his religious opinions. The constitution of this state likewise provides, that no person, shall on any occasion, be molested on account of religious sentiments; and as I am not charged with the commission of any crime, neither accused of immoral conduct or a disorderly walk—and as it cannot be a crime to think, or honestly to differ concerning the general import of the scriptures, I can find no sufficient grounds for censure; the session will therefore, expect nothing further from me, until the question, as to the legality of the course pursued, is decided.

I will only add, that if a dissolution of the connexion existing between the church and me, is the object of the proceedings against me; that object may be accomplished without a trial, as I have already requested a dismission from the church.

Please to accept the assurance of my sincere regard for yourselves, and all the members of the church; and believe me to be ever yours in the bands of that Gospel, which proclaims "glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men." JERUSHA TORREY.

To the above letter, the following answer was returned.

SECOND CITATION.

Brownville, March 1.

Mrs. Jerusha Torrey,—By order of the session, I hereby cite you to appear before them at my house, on the 11th of the present month, at 3 o'clock, P. M. for the object stated in the first citation.—Done by order of session,

N. M. WELLS, *Mod'r.*

Brownville, March 11.

To the Rev. N. M. Wells, moderator of the session,—Sir,—You doubtless recollect that in my letter of the 26th ult. I questioned the right of the session to call me to an account, merely for an honest difference of opinion; which question, I laid before the session in the letter above alluded to, and I have been impatiently waiting their decision. I assure you, sir, that this question arose from a strict examination of our articles of faith, and the articles of discipline, connected with the express declaration of the laws of our country. As I have requested a dismission from the church, and do still request it; I must confess, I am unable to discover the least ground you can have for your proceeding against me. I wish you to inform me by the bearer of this, of the decision of the session on the above mentioned question, & the disciplinary ground of the decision; by so doing, you will very much oblige your friend,

JERUSHA TORREY.

The above was answered by a *Third Citation.*

Brownville, March 11.

Mrs. Jerusha Torrey,—You are hereby cited to appear before the session on the ground of the first citation sent you, at your own house, on Tuesday the 23d of the present month, at 3 o'clock, P. M.

Done by order of the session.

N. M. WELLS, *Mod'r.*

On the 23d. of March (agreeably to previous arrangement) the Session met at the house of Capt. Torrey, and after they had organized, Mrs. Torrey read to them the following

DEFENCE.

Having been cited to appear before the Session of the Church, to answer to charges prefered against me by the church, or its session; I deem it my duty (as the Session appears determined to persevere in those charges, and to proceed to a trial against me,) to offer a few brief remarks, explanatory, and in vindication of my conduct and sentiments.—By the discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, I find that "an offence is any thing in the principles or practice of a church member, which is contrary to the word of God." Chap. 1 Sect. 3. Now if it should appear on examination that the principles, which I am accused of entertaining, are not "contrary to the word of God," but are clearly and unequivocally taught in the scriptures, I trust I shall be exonerated wholly from the charges.

The substance of the charge preferred against me is, that I have departed from those articles of faith, to which I have once given my assent, and which are believed by the Church to be the fundamental principles of the Gospel. If a departure from articles of faith to which a person has once been induced to give his assent, constitute a crime, it follows, that if any person has had the misfortune to be brought up in the belief of the Roman Catholic religion, or even in the religion of Mahomet, he has no right ever to depart from the articles of his religion, on any pretext whatever. The establishment of such a principle as this, it will readily be seen, is directly calculated to put a final end to all enquiry and investigation into religious subjects; and to chain the human mind in fetters of eternal darkness and ignorance. Under the general charge exhibited against me, there are several specifications or particulars which I shall now proceed to take up in order as they are presented, and endeavour to answer as well as my feeble abilities will permit.

The first specification, accuses me of denying the doctrine of the trinity, or in other words that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This I presume is considered a departure from the first article of faith received by the Church. On carefully examining that article, and comparing its several parts with each other, and also with the second article, there appeared long ago to my mind, to be a plain contradiction in the articles; and if I adopted the belief of the doctrine of three distinct persons in the Godhead, I must have rejected the idea that there is but "one God," or that this "one God" is "one undivided essence;" as seperate personality, clearly implies separate and distinct beings. In this dilemma, what could I do? To what source could I apply for instruction? The word of God was the only source, which presented itself to my mind, as being the only sure rule and guide of faith, and to that I candidly, diligently and prayerfully applied myself, and through the goodness of Almighty God I was enabled to satisfy my mind on this important subject. There is no truth which appears to me to be more plainly taught in the scriptures of divine truth than the unity of the Godhead. When our Saviour was asked by the scribe, "which is the 1st commandment of all" he answered, (Mark xii. 29.) "Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord," and when the scribe told him that he had "said the truth; for there is one God; and there is none other but he;" Christ saw that he "answered discreetly," and said to him, "thou art not far from the kingdom of God." Again John xvii. 3. Our Saviour says, "and this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The Apostle Paul, also taught the unity of God, in as plain and positive terms as language will admit. See 1 Cor. viii. 5. 6. "For though there be that are called gods whether in Heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things and we by him." It appears to me that the Apostle in this expression, could not intend to be understood as conveying the idea of a plurality of persons in the Godhead, or that the "one Lord Jesus Christ," was the "one God," or any part of him. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the same apostle informs us, that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv. 5. 6. Here again the a-

postle appears to be careful to keep in mind the unity of God, and the distinction between him and the "one Lord." Again 1 Tim. ii. 5. the Apostle informs us that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Who could infer from this expression, that the apostle intended to convey the idea, that the "one God" and the "one Mediator" were one and the same being? I know that much dependence is put, by the advocates of the doctrine of the trinity, on these words of our Saviour, "I and my Father are one;" but admitting this passage is to be taken in its most literal and unlimited sense, it only proves that there are *two* persons in the Godhead, and not three. By this mode of reasoning, we should prove that Paul and Apollos were but one individual being; for the Apostle, after stating that he had planted and Apollos had watered, declared "he that planteth and he that watereth are one." The oneness of which our Saviour as well as the Apostle spoke, was undoubtedly a unity of design, or perfect agreement in acting, and this idea seems to be clearly proved by the words of Christ himself. John xvii. 11. "Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are one;" and again from the 20th to the 23d. verses inclusive, "neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me." No one can suppose that our saviour intended to convey the idea, that his twelve disciples, much less all those who should believe on him through their word, were to be considered distinct persons in the Godhead; and yet he prays that they may be one, in the same sense that he and the Father are one. From the above, and many other equally clear and positive testimonies of the scriptures, I became fully convinced of the unity of God, and consequently, that the doctrine of the trinity could not be true.

The next specification accuses me of denying the "Godhead of the *Son*, and his equality with the Father." I admit this charge to be true; and so long as I take the scriptures as the only rule of my faith, I must continue to deny that the *Son* is the Father, or equal to him; and the same scriptures which I have quoted to prove the unity of God, disprove the Godhead of the *Son*. It is true that the *Son* is sometimes in the scriptures called God; but are we to infer from this, that he is the eternal, supreme, self-existent God? Men were sometimes called gods, as appears from the passage already quoted from i. Cor. and also from John x. 34, 35, 36. "Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified & sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said I am the son of God." It appears evident from this, that Christ did not intend to represent himself to the Jews as God, but to convince them that he was not guilty of blasphemy, in calling himself the "son of God." But it may be said that his name is called "Emanuel, which being interpreted is God with us." It appears that names which signify God, were frequently given to men, such as the following: Abiel, God my father; Elijah, God the Lord; Lemuel, God with them; but it never was contended on this account, that they were really and essentially God, but that they received those names in consequence of some particular offices they were called to fill. So I conceive it was with Christ; he was called God, because through him were manifested to the world the true character, attributes, perfections and will of God.

I will now proceed to quote a few of the testimonies which Jesus gave of himself, and which, (if they can be relied on) most clearly and explicitly establish the truth of his being inferior to, and dependant on the Father. John viii. 42. "For I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came I of myself, but he sent me." Again, Chap. xiv. 28. "For my father is greater than I." And again, chap. iii. 35. "The Father loveth the *Son*, and hath given all things into his hand." I can see no propropriety in the above expressions, if he were really God, and eternally possessed all things, or if he were equal to God; for

it is a plain contradiction in terms to say, that any thing which is inherent in any being, was given him by another being, or that either of two beings, who were on a perfect equality with each other, was greater than the other; and also that any being who possessed self-existence, derived that existence from any other source.—When the Jews accused Jesus of making himself equal with the Father, he says, John v. 19. "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do;" and again, v. 26 he says, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here dependance upon the Father is plainly expressed, not only for the possession of life, but also for the power of action; and we find, thro' the whole of his life, that he constantly acknowledged his entire dependence on God, of which his frequent supplications and prayers afford incontestible evidence; and that he was a created being, is evident from Rev. iii. 14, where he calls himself the "beginning of the creation of God." We find likewise, by his own confession, that his knowledge was limited, for he says to his disciples, Mark xiii. 32, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." If he be God, (and all agree in this that God knows all things) how could he say that he did not know of that day and that hour? If it be answered, that he spake in his human nature and not in his divine, I reply, that I cannot discover that he ever intimated, when speaking of himself, as dependant on and inferior to the Father, that he was speaking of his human nature in opposition to his divine, or any other which he possessed; neither do I find that he ever intimated that he possessed more than one nature. But this is not all—we find by referring to the last quoted passage, that what he said was in answer to his own disciples, who asked him when these things should be. If we suppose that he knew the time in any sense, or in any nature which he possessed, do we not (to say the least of it) accuse him of deception and duplicity? This answer, as was before observed, was made to his disciples—to those who were under his immediate care and instruction, and to whom he had said, Mark iv. 11, "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God." That Christ acknowledges a superior, even in his risen glory, is apparent. Rev. iii 12. "Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is New-Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name." Four times in this one verse he speaks of one, whom he acknowledges to be his God.—But this subject is made perfectly clear by the testimony of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power, for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet; the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death; for he hath put all things under his feet: But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him; and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

Having shown that my sentiments on this subject, are *not* "contrary to the word of God," but clearly taught in it, I shall now proceed to the third specification, which accuses me of denying "the personality & divinity of the Holy Ghost." I was not a little surprised that this charge was made and connected with the others, which were preferred against me on the authority of *common fame*, as I had never expressed my sentiments on that subject, neither on the subject of the fourth charge, until I expressed them in my answers to the questions put to me by the committee appointed by the session to call on me, a short time previous to receiving the citation and a copy of the charges preferred. As all the information which the public could possibly have received on those subjects, must have been derived through that committee, it seems almost incredible, that it should become a matter of public notoriety in so very short a time. After what I have already stated, on the subject of the unity of the Godhead, it will not be expected that I should admit the principle of the personality of the Holy Ghost; and as I have never expressed my opinion (neither was the question ever put to me by the committee) respecting the divinity of the Holy Ghost, I might here dismiss this part of the sub-

ject; but being perfectly willing that the church, and the whole world should know my belief on this subject, I shall state it in a few words. As I understand the scriptures, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter or the Holy Spirit, is the Spirit of God, or God's Spirit; "the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father." John xv. 26. It is true this spirit is personified in the scriptures; so also are wisdom, knowledge and understanding; but personification does not, in my opinion, imply personality; if it does, it evidently follows that wisdom, knowledge and understanding are distinct persons in the Godhead, as they are undoubtedly attributes of Deity.

The fourth specification charges me with denying "the divine institution and sanctity of the Holy Sabbath." On examining the written articles of the church, to which I assented, I find there is nothing said concerning the Sabbath; it cannot be said, therefore, that I have violated those articles by my opinion on this subject, let that be what it may—but as I think I have adopted no sentiments which are not consistent with scripture, I will proceed to explain my views concerning the Sabbath.

The Sabbath, I believe, at its first institution, was intended wholly for the Jews, and was given to them by God for particular purposes. After the account which we have in the second chapter of Genesis, of God's resting on the seventh day and hallowing it, (and it is worthy of remark, that in this account, this day is not called the Sabbath) we have no account of any day or time, which was considered holy time, for the space of more than two thousand years; when we are informed that God instituted the Sabbath, or rather gave it to the Jews, while they were sojourning in the wilderness; and we learn from Exodus xxxi. 16. 17. what the purposes of God were, in giving the Sabbath. "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a *sign* between me and the children of Israel forever." And again, God says by the prophet Ezekiel, xx. 11, 12, "And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall even live in them. Moreover also, I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a *sign* between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." From these expressions we learn, that the Sabbath was given to the children of Israel for a *covenant* or a *sign* between God and them, and on this account, its observance as a day of rest, was obligatory upon them.—Whatever Christ taught, I consider obligatory on christians to believe and obey; and although he deemed himself to be Lord, even of the Sabbath day, we do not find that he ever taught his disciples to observe it. When he was asked by the Jewish lawyer which was the great commandment in the law, he answered, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment; and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commands hang all the law and the prophets" By this it appears, that he did not consider the observance of the Sabbath, as forming any part of the divine law. It is evident from Col. xi. 16, 17. that St. Paul considered the Sabbath as a part of the Jewish ritual, and as such, not binding upon christians.—"Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." I consider it not *absolutely* necessary, but at the same time highly important for the good of society at large, and of individuals, that a day of rest from the toils and business of life—a day for the public worship of God, and for private worship and meditation, should return at stated intervals, and as the first day of the week was the day on which Christ arose from the dead, and brought life and immortality to light; and as it is also the day which is set apart by the laws of our country, as a day of rest, and cessation from worldly cares and pursuits, I consider it the duty of every christian, to observe it, and to appropriate it to public and private worship, reading and meditation, not however forgetting, that it is "lawful to do good on the Sabbath days," and that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."

(To be concluded in our next.)

"Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me: and to him that ordereth his conversation aright, will I shew the salvation of God."

PSALMS.

POETRY.

HYMN.

There's not a tint that paints the rose,
  Or decks the lilly fair,
Or streaks the humblest flower that grows,
  But heaven has placed it there!

At early dawn, there's not a gale
  Across the landscape driven,
And not a breeze that sweeps the vale,
  That is not sent by Heaven.

There's not of grass a simple blade,
  Or leaf of lowliest mien,
Where heavenly skill is not desply'd,
  And heavenly wisdom seen.

There's not a tempest dark and dread,
  Or storm that rends the air,
Or blast that sweeps o'er ocean's bed,
  But Heaven's own voice is there.

There's not a star whose twinkling light
  Illuminates the distant earth,
And cheers the solemn gloom of night,
  But mercy gives it birth.

There's not a cloud whose dews distil
  Upon the parching clod,
And clothe with verdure vale and hill,
  That is not sent by God.

There's not a place in earth's vast round,
  In ocean, deep, or air,
Where skill and wisdom are not found—
  For God is every where.

Around, beneath, below, above,
  Wherever space extends,
There heaven displays its boundless love,
  And power with mercy blends.

Then rise my soul and sing His name,
  And all his praise rehearse,
Who spread abroad earth's glorious frame,
  And built the universe.

Where'er thine earthly lot is cast,
  His power and love declare.
Nor think the mighty theme too vast—
  For God is every where.

Confidence in God in a Thunder Storm.

The rain descends, the tempests rise—
  My soul his Majesty adore!
Jehovah's voice sounds through the skies,
  While lightnings flash, & thunders roar.

I sit becalm'd while others fear,
  The God who thunders is my ALL;
It is my Father's voice I hear,
  Nor shall I by his thunder fall.

No, while his lightnings flash around,
  Although the earth's foundations move,
I stand secure on faith's firm ground,
  I rest in his unchanging love.

Nothing shall fright my soul from God,
  Should he the skies this moment rend,
He is my only safe obode:
  My rock, my refuge, and my friend.

From the (Litchfield) American Eagle.

The following facts may be relied on as having occurred within the last 6 months. The daughter of a very poor man, who is supported as a state pauper, believing it her duty to give for the benefit of the heathen, or contribute to the missionary cause, called upon the Rev. Pastor of the parish to which she belongs, and presented him with a gown pattern for the benefit of the Elliot or Choctaw mission. This gown was received by the clergyman, and deposited among the articles of clothing by him received for that purpose. The girl has no other means, other than her own labor, to procure money. Her mother has not for some months attended public worship for want of clothes. Her smaller sister cannot attend school for want of shoes; and the family, in addition to the small aid received from the state, of about 70 cents per week, are supported by begging from one house to another, a little indian meal here, a little milk there, and a little meat in another place; and all these facts exist and occur daily before the Rev. Clergyman, and his immediate neighborhood.

Is it the duty of this girl to give? Is it the duty of this clergyman, under these circumstances, to receive?

NOTICE.

The Black River Branch of the Western Association of Universalists in the State of New York, will meet on the last Wednesday in June and the first day of July next, in the Village of Brownville.

This meeting was adjourned to meet on the *fourth* Wednesday and Thursday in June next—but for many important reasons it becomes necessary to postpone it until the *last* Wednesday in June and the Thursday following.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 00 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.